



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/747,867

12/23/2003

B.J. Herbison

SUN03-12(040036)

2764

7590

05/12/2006

Barry W. Chapin, Esq.
CHAPIN & HUANG, L.L.C.
Westborough Office Park
1700 West Park Drive
Westborough, MA 01581

EXAMINER

HUTTON JR, WILLIAM D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 05/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/747,867	HERBISON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Doug Hutton	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 December 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it exceeds 150 words in length. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

- The phrase “*map the XML files*” on Page 11, Lines 25-26 should be amended to — map each XML file — because the syntax processor maps each XML file to a particular javabeen component.
- The term “*n*” on Page 12, Line 8 should be amended to — an — because it appears to be a typographic error.
- The number “38” on Page 10, Line 3 should be amended to — 36 — because that is the proper drawing element number (see Figure 1). This error should be corrected everywhere it occurs throughout the Specification. Alternatively, Applicant may amend the drawing to correspond to the Specification.
- The number “36” on Page 10, Line 5 should be amended to — 38 — because that is the proper drawing element number (see Figure 1). This error should be corrected everywhere it occurs throughout the Specification. Alternatively, Applicant may amend the drawing to correspond to the Specification.

Appropriate correction is required.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: 17.1 through 17.4 (see *Specification* → Page 17, Lines 5-6, referencing Figures 3, 8 and 9); 36.1 through 36.4 (see *Specification* → Page 17, Line 6, referencing Figures 3, 8 and 9); 26-1 (see *Specification* → Page 17, Line 9, referencing Figures 3, 8 and 9); 30-1 (see *Specification* → Page 17, Line 15, referencing Figures 3, 8 and 9); 36-11 and 36-12 (see *Specification* → Page 17, Lines 16-17, referencing Figures 3, 8 and 9). These element numbers are located in additional portions of the *Specification*, and all must be corrected.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

Claims 1, 15 and 29-31 are objected to because of the following informalities:

- In Claim 1, the term “said” should be inserted between the terms “*content*” and “*generating*” in Line 6 because the “generating” step is previously mentioned in the claim (see Line 6). Claims 15 and 29-31 have the same problem.
- In Claim 1, the term “the” should be inserted between the terms “*and*” and “*display*” in Line 8 because the “display data” is previously mentioned in the claim (see Line 7). Claims 15 and 29-31 have the same problem.

Claims 2 and 16 are objected to because of the following informalities:

- In Claim 2, the term “an” should be inserted between the terms “*for*” and “*HTML*” in Line 1 so that the limitation is grammatically correct. Claim 16 has the same problem.
- In Claim 2, the term “said” should be inserted between the terms “*wherein*” and “*building*” in Line 2 because the “building” step is previously mentioned in the claims (see Claim 1, Line 10). Claim 16 has the same problem.

Claim 4 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- The term “*producing*” in Line 1 should be amended to — said building — because that is how the function is previously identified (see Claim 1, Line 10).

Claim 6 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- The term “said” should be inserted between the terms “*and*” and “*generating*” in Line 2 because the “generating” step is previously mentioned in the claims (see Claim 1, Line 6). Claim 20 has the same problem.

Claims 7 and 21 are objected to because of the following informalities:

- In Claim 7, the term “*where*” in Line 1 should be amended to — wherein — so that the limitation is grammatically correct. Claim 21 has the same problem.

Claims 12 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- In Claim 12, the phrase “the method further comprising:” should be inserted at the end of Line 2 because the subsequent limitations further define the method.

Claims 13 and 27 are objected to because of the following informalities:

- In Claim 13, the phrase “*the predetermined syntax*” in Line 2 should be amended to — the *a predetermined syntax* — because no “predetermined syntax” is previously mentioned in the claims. Claim 27 has the same problem.
- In Claim 13, the term “said” should be inserted between the terms “*and*” and “*processing*” in Lines 2-3 because the “processing” step is previously mentioned in the claims (see Claim 12, Line 4). Claim 20 has the same problem.
- In Claim 13, the phrase “*javabeen components*” in Line 3 should be amended to — javabeen component — because that is how the component is previously identified (see Claim 12, Lines 1-2). Claim 20 has the same problem.

- In Claim 13, the phrase "*page descriptors*" in Line 4 should be amended to — at least one page descriptor — because that is how the component is previously identified (see Line 2). Claim 20 has the same problem.

Claims 14 and 28 are objected to because of the following informalities:

- In Claim 1, the term "*view*" in Line 4 should be amended to — views — because that is how the element is previously identified (see Lines 1-2). Claim 28 has the same problem.

Claim 18 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- The number "*1*" in Line 1 should be amended to — 15 — because it appears to be a typographic error.

Claim 22 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- The number "*15*" in Line 1 should be amended to — 19 — because it appears to be a typographic error.

Claim 23 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- The number "*15*" in Line 1 should be amended to — 22 — because it appears to be a typographic error.

Claim 25 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- The number “15” in Line 1 should be amended to — 24 — because it appears to be a typographic error.

Claim 26 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- The number “15” in Line 1 should be amended to — 24 — because it appears to be a typographic error.
- The term “identifying” in Line 2 should be amended to — identify — so that the claim is grammatically correct.

Claim 29 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- The phrase “*operable to store*” in Lines 1-2 should be amended to — storing — so that the claim positively recites that the “*computer readable medium*” stores the “*computer program code*.”

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 15-28, 30 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 15-28:

The language of the claims raise a question as to whether the claims are directed merely to an abstract idea that would not result in a practical application producing a concrete, useful, and tangible result to form the basis of statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101.

In summary, Claim 15 recites a “*device*” that is “*operable to*” perform various functions for producing a report. The “*device*” is comprised solely of computer software that is “*operable to*” perform the functions. Thus, the recited invention is computer software *per se*. Additionally, the claim recites that the software is “***operable to***” perform the various functions rather than positively reciting that the functions **are** performed.

A computer program is merely a set of instructions capable of being executed by a computer. The computer program itself is not a statutory process in that it does not include the computer-readable medium needed to realize the functionality of the computer program. Thus, as currently recited, Claim 15 is directed to an abstract idea that does not produce a concrete, useful and tangible result.

Claims 16-28 either merely recite additional computer software components or additional functions that the software is “*operable to*” perform, or further specify the particular types of content that are manipulated by the software. Thus, none of Claims 16-28 recite statutory subject matter.

Claim 30:

The language of the claim raises a question as to whether the claim is directed merely to an abstract idea that would not result in a practical application producing a concrete, useful, and tangible result to form the basis of statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claim 30 recites a “*data signal*” for producing a report. The recited invention, as a whole, does not fit into a statutory class as defined in 35 U.S.C. 101 (i.e., a “process,” a “machine,” a “manufacture” or a “composition of matter”).

Claim 31:

The language of the claim raises a question as to whether the claim is directed merely to an abstract idea that would not result in a practical application producing a concrete, useful, and tangible result to form the basis of statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101.

In summary, Claim 31 recites a “*device*” that comprises “*means for*” performing various functions for producing a report. The “*device*” is comprised solely of computer software. Thus, the recited invention is computer software *per se*.

A computer program is merely a set of instructions capable of being executed by a computer. The computer program itself is not a statutory process in that it does not include the computer-readable medium needed to realize the functionality of the computer program. Thus, as currently recited, Claim 31 is directed to an abstract idea that does not produce a concrete, useful and tangible result.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-11, 14-25 and 28-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hefetz et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2004/0123238 (hereinafter, Hefetz).

Claim 1:

Hefetz discloses *a method for producing an output report* (see Figure 6 → Hefetz discloses this limitation, as clearly indicated in the cited figure) *comprising:*

- *identifying a page template indicative of an output report having passive content, the passive content being static* (see Page 1, Paragraph 0003; see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the page layout deployment system, when the portal receives a request from a user, obtains a template that includes static content);
- *parsing tokens from the page template, the tokens indicative of dynamic content, the dynamic content adapted to provide at least a portion of the output report* (see Page 1, Paragraph 0003; see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see

Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Pages 4-5, Paragraph 0042 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system parses the template for placeholders, locates the placeholders and replaces them with dynamic content to generate a web page in response to the user's request);

- *for each token, generating the dynamic content, generating further comprising fetching output data and processing display data, the output data operable to be retrieved from a dynamic repository and display data operable to indicate organization of the fetched output data (see Page 1, Paragraph 0003; see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Pages 4-5, Paragraph 0042; see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system replaces the located placeholders with dynamic content using ILayoutStructure objects and iViews); and*
- *building the output report by assembling the generated dynamic content for each token in the page template (see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation, as clearly indicated in the cited text).*

Claim 2:

Hefetz discloses *the method of Claim 1, further comprising:*

- *receiving a user request for HTML page, wherein building further comprises rendering the HTML page responsive to the user request (see Page 1, Paragraph 0007; see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Page 5, Paragraph 0048; see Pages 4-5, Paragraph*

0042; see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system generates a web page in response to the user's request).

Claim 3:

Hefetz discloses *the method of Claim 1, wherein the dynamic content further comprises java server pages referencing metalanguage representations of at least portions of other java server pages corresponding to the same rendered output report* (see Figure 5; see Page 1, Paragraph 0003; see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Pages 4-5, Paragraph 0042; see Pages 5-6, Paragraphs 0048-0055; see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system comprises JSPs that include XMLs containers, wherein the system translates the placeholders into presentations of the containers comprising the obtained dynamic content).

Claim 4:

Hefetz discloses *the method of Claim 1, further comprising:*

- *receiving an HTTP request on behalf of a user, the HTTP request indicative of an HTML response* (see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system, when the portal receives a request from a user, generates the web page in response to the user's request);

- *determining the page template corresponding to the requested HTML response* (see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system obtains the template based on the request that is received from the user);
- *generating, in a rendering engine, a JSP output page from the identified page template* (see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Page 5, Paragraph 0048; see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system generates the web page using JSP); *and*
- *transmitting the generated JSP output page to the user as an HTML page* (see Page 1, Paragraph 0007; see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Page 5, Paragraph 0048; see Pages 4-5, Paragraph 0042; see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system transmits the web page in response to the user's request).

Claim 5:

Hefetz discloses *the method of Claim 1, wherein the display data is formatted according to a predetermined syntax, the predetermined syntax operable for parsing and verification of the display data* (see Figures 5 and 6; see Page 1, Paragraph 0003; see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Pages 4-5, Paragraph 0042; see Pages 5-6, Paragraphs 0048-0055; see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system comprises

JSPs that include XML containers, wherein the system translates the placeholders into presentations of the containers comprising the obtained dynamic content).

Claim 6:

Hefetz discloses *the method of Claim 5, wherein the predetermined syntax, the predetermined syntax is a different syntax than the template and generating further comprises interpreting the display data from the predetermined syntax into the syntax defining the template* (see Figures 5 and 6; see Page 1, Paragraph 0003; see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Pages 4-5, Paragraph 0042; see Pages 5-6, Paragraphs 0048-0055; see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system comprises JSPs that include XML containers, wherein the system translates the placeholders into presentations of the containers comprising the obtained dynamic content).

Claim 7:

Hefetz discloses *the method of Claim 5, where the predetermined syntax includes syntactical elements, and is further operable for nesting the syntactical elements, the nested syntactical elements defining a hierarchical structure* (see Figures 5 and 6; see Page 1, Paragraph 0003; see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Pages 4-5, Paragraph 0042; see Pages 5-6, Paragraphs 0048-0055; see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system comprises JSPs that include XML containers, wherein the

system translates the placeholders into presentations of the containers comprising the obtained dynamic content).

Claim 8:

Hefetz discloses *the method of Claim 5, wherein the dynamic content is active content and the predetermined syntax conforms to XML, in which the syntactical elements further comprise XML tags* (see Figures 5 and 6; see Page 1, Paragraph 0003; see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Pages 4-5, Paragraph 0042; see Pages 5-6, Paragraphs 0048-0055; see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system comprises JSPs that include XML containers, wherein the system translates the placeholders into presentations of the containers comprising the obtained dynamic content).

Claim 9:

Hefetz discloses *the method of Claim 8, wherein the predetermined syntax is a page descriptor syntax defined by an XML schema* (see Figures 5 and 6; see Page 1, Paragraph 0003; see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Pages 4-5, Paragraph 0042; see Pages 5-6, Paragraphs 0048-0055; see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system comprises JSPs that include XML containers, wherein the system translates the placeholders into presentations of the containers comprising the obtained dynamic content).

Claim 10:

Hefetz discloses *the method of Claim 1, wherein the tokens are metadata tokens* (see Figures 5 and 6; see Page 1, Paragraph 0003; see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Pages 4-5, Paragraph 0042; see Pages 5-6, Paragraphs 0048-0055; see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system comprises JSPs that include XML containers, wherein the system translates the placeholders into presentations of the containers comprising the obtained dynamic content), *further comprising:*

- *parsing the metadata tokens from the page template, each of the metadata tokens indicative of dynamic content* (see Page 1, Paragraph 0003; see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Pages 4-5, Paragraph 0042 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system parses the template for placeholders, locates the placeholders and replaces them with dynamic content to generate a web page in response to the user's request);
- *retrieving, from a metadata repository, metadata components corresponding to the metadata tokens and operable to provide the dynamic content corresponding to the parsed metadata token* (see Figures 5 and 6; see Page 1, Paragraph 0003; see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Pages 4-5, Paragraph 0042; see Pages 5-6, Paragraphs 0048-0055; see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system comprises JSPs that include XML containers, wherein the system

translates the placeholders into presentations of the containers comprising the obtained dynamic content);

- *retrieving, based on the metadata components, the display data and the output data from a repository, the display data and output data corresponding to the dynamic content for rendering on the output report (see Page 1, Paragraph 0003; see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Pages 4-5, Paragraph 0042; see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system replaces the located placeholders with dynamic content using ILayoutStructure objects and iViews);*
- *processing the metadata components using the retrieved display data and output data to generate the dynamic content corresponding to the parsed metadata token (see Page 1, Paragraph 0003; see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Pages 4-5, Paragraph 0042; see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system replaces the located placeholders with dynamic content using ILayoutStructure objects and iViews); and*
- *inserting the dynamic content in the output report by replacing the metadata token (see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation, as clearly indicated in the cited text).*

Claim 11:

Hefetz discloses *the method of Claim 10, wherein the metadata components further comprise page descriptors, the page descriptors conforming to a declarative syntax and indicative of the dynamic content* (see Figures 5 and 6; see Page 1, Paragraph 0003; see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Pages 4-5, Paragraph 0042; see Pages 5-6, Paragraphs 0048-0055; see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system comprises JSPs that include XML containers, wherein the system translates the placeholders into presentations of the containers comprising the obtained dynamic content).

Claim 14:

Hefetz discloses *the method of Claim 1, wherein the display data further comprises user specific views, the user specific views indicative of formatting and display preference specific to a particular user and operable for interpretation by syntax processing components to render the display data according to the user specific view* (see Page 1, Paragraph 0003; see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Pages 4-5, Paragraph 0042; see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system personalizes the views presented to particular users).

Claims 15-25 and 28:

Claims 15-25 and 28 merely recite a device that performs the methods of Claims 1-11 and 14, respectively. Thus, Claims 15-25 and 28 are rejected using the same rationale, as specified in the above rejections for Claims 1-11 and 14.

Claim 29:

Claim 29 merely recites computer software for performing the method of Claim 1. Thus, Claim 29 is rejected using the same rationale, as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1.

Claim 30:

Claim 30 merely recites a data signal for performing the method of Claim 1. Thus, Claim 30 is rejected using the same rationale, as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1.

Claim 31:

Claim 31 merely recites a device for performing the method of Claim 1. Thus, Claim 31 is rejected using the same rationale, as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 12, 13, 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hefetz, in view of Sulistio et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,036,072 (hereinafter, Sulistio).

Claim 12:

As indicated in the above rejection, Hefetz discloses every limitation of Claim 1. Hefetz also discloses that *the parsing further comprises identifying a software component operable to process the metadata token, wherein the metadata component is retrieved and processed by the software component* (see Figures 5 and 6; see Page 1, Paragraph 0003; see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Pages 4-5, Paragraph 0042; see Pages 5-6, Paragraphs 0048-0055; see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system translates the placeholders into presentations of the containers comprising the obtained dynamic content).

Hefetz fails to expressly disclose:

- *identifying a **javabeen** operable to process the metadata token.*

Sulistio teaches a system for handling documents in electronic commerce, comprising:

- *javabeans operable to act upon a document* (see Figures 7, 8 and 19; see Column 5, Line 34 through Column 6, Line 57; see Column 37, Line 58 through Column 38, Line 20 → Sulistio teaches this limitation in that the system processes XML documents using schemas and javabeans to make declarative transformations of the documents),
- for the purpose of simplifying the processing of documents using declarative methods and components (see Column 2, Lines 13-19).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method, disclosed in Hefetz, to include:

- *identifying a **java**bean operable to process the metadata token*,
- for the purpose of simplifying the processing of documents using declarative methods and components, as taught by Sulistio.

Claim 13:

Hefetz discloses *metadata components [that] are XML files including at least one page descriptor according to the predetermined syntax, and processing [that] further comprises retrieving the page descriptors by the software components and producing HTML code corresponding to the page descriptors* (see Figures 5 and 6; see Page 1,

Paragraph 0003; see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Pages 4-5, Paragraph 0042; see Pages 5-6, Paragraphs 0048-0055; see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system comprises JSPs that include XML containers, wherein the system translates the placeholders into presentations of the containers comprising the obtained dynamic content).

Claims 26 and 27:

Claims 26 and 27 merely recite a device that performs the methods of Claims 12 and 13, respectively. Thus, Claims 26 and 27 are rejected using the same rationale, as specified in the above rejections for Claims 12 and 13.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: Davis et al., Application Publication No. US 2004/0148565; Bernstein et al., Application Publication No. US 2003/0014443; Akkiraju et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2003/0191677; Hsu et al., Application Publication No. US 2004/0098396; Inanoria, Application Publication No. US 2004/0046789; Weathersby et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2005/0210379; Sobel et al., Application Publication No. US 2004/0210500; and Beisiegel et al., Application Publication No. US 2004/0168124.

Art Unit: 2176

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Doug Hutton whose telephone number is 571-272-4137. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached at (571) 272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2100.

WDH
May 10, 2006



**DOUG HUTTON
PRIMARY EXAMINER
TECH CENTER 2100**